

Appln No. 10/760,206
Amdt. Dated June 13, 2006
Response to Office Action of March 22, 2006

3

Remarks/Arguments

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Official Action dated March 22, 2006. In response to the issues raised, we offer the following submissions and amendments.

Amendments

The claims have been amended to cancel claim 1 and re-cast the invention in newly presented claim 6. Newly presented claim 6 highlights the invention distinguishing features discussed at page 3, lines 13-20, and page 12, line 22 to page 23, line 4.

Accordingly, we submit that the amendments do not add any new matter.

Drawings

Newly presented claim 6 defines the system in terms of one inkjet printer cradle only. The drawings clearly disclose a cradle for use in the printing system and therefore comply with 37 CFR 1.121(d).

Specification

Pursuant to the above, the description and drawings provide adequate support for the cradle defined in new claim 6.

Claims – 35USC§102

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,199,977 to Komplin et al.

New claim 6 defines the system to have a range of cartridges, each with differing performance characteristics. Of this range, only a set of the cartridges are operatively supported by the cradle. This gives users the flexibility to upgrade or downgrade their printer while ensuring that the system integrity is preserved by preventing unsupported cartridges from being installed in the cradle recess.

Komplin fails to teach a cradle that will accept a number of cartridges, each having differing performance characteristics. The Examiner has equated each of the cartridge slots 134, 136, 138 and 140 to be individual cradles. Each cartridge slot is configured to receive only one of the cyan, magenta or yellow cartridges. There is no description or suggestion of any of the slots 134, 136, 138 or 140 receiving any cartridge other than identical cartridges. Therefore, the '977 reference fails to anticipate the present invention defined by new claim 6.

Claims – 35USC§103

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected as obvious in light of Komplin in view of US 6,250,738 to Waller. Similarly, claim 5 stands rejected as obvious in light of Komplin in view of US 6,390,615 to Carrese et al.

As discussed above, Komplin fails to disclose a cradle that will only accept a cartridge from a set of supported cartridges, each cartridge having different performance characteristics. Those cartridges in the range that are not supported by the cradle do not have a shape complementary to that of the cradle recess. Waller and Carrese also fail to teach this claim element. As the

Appln No. 10/760,206
Amdt. Dated June 13, 2006
Response to Office Action of March 22, 2006

4

combined disclosures of the cited references do not teach all the elements of the claimed combination, they do not support a §103 rejection. Accordingly, claims 2, 3 and 5 are not obvious in view of the respective citations.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the claim rejections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,
Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762